R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 015 285 VT 003 802

THE "MACK" WORKER, THE IMPACT OF HIS JOB LOSS 2 1/2 YEARS LATER. AUTOMATION MANPOWER SERVICES, PROGRAM REPORT.

BY- INDIK, BERNARD P.
NEW JERSEY STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE, TRENTON
BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY (DEPT. OF LABOR)

PUB DATE DEC 65

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.40 33P.

DESCRIPTORS- *UNEMPLOYED, EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS, *EMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS, WORK EXPERIENCE, EMPLOYMENT SERVICES, *FOLLOWUP STUDIES, INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS, OCCUPATIONAL SURVEYS, MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY, MACK TRUCK CORPORATION, PLAINFIELD, NEW JERSEY,

THE LONG TERM CONSEQUENCES OF A LARGE PLANT SHUTDOWN IN TERMS OF THE INDIVIDUALS INVOLVED AND CHARACTERISTICS SHOWN TO BE IMPORTANT INDICATORS OF THEIR REEMPLOYABILITY WERE DESCRIBED IN A 1962 STUDY. THIS FOLLOWUP STUDY CLARIFIED AND AMPLIFIED THE EARLIER FINDINGS TO SHOW MORE LONG TERM CONSEQUENCES. OF THE 3,100 PEOPLE LAID OFF, THE ORIGINAL STUDY HAD A SAMPLE OF 2,456 AND THE FOLLOWUP A MATCHED SAMPLE OF 1,117. GENERALLY, THE FOLLOWUP FINDINGS REINFORCED THOSE OF THE ORIGINAL STUDY AND REAFFIRMED ITS CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. CHARACTERISTICS DIFFERENTIATING THE EMPLOYED FROM THE UNEMPLOYED AT THE TIME OF BOTH STUDIES AND COMPARISON OF THESE CHARACTERISTICS IN BOTH STUDIES WERE REPORTED. IN 1962, 20.4 PERCENT, AND IN 1964, 23 PERCENT WERE UNEMPLOYED. OF THE 76 PERCENT WORKING IN 1964, 59 PERCENT WERE WORKING AT THE SAME JOB, 27 PERCENT HAD HAD TWO JOBS, AND 17 PERCENT HAD HAD THREE OR MORE JOBS, AND OF THOSE NOT WORKING, OVER 45 PERCENT HAD WORKED SINCE THE LAYOFF, AND 42.5 PERCENT HAD NOT WORKED. BOTH SAMPLES SHOWED HIGHER UNEMPLOYMENT AMONG THOSE WITH ONLY A GRAMMAR SCHOOL EDUCATION, AND BOTH INDICATED THAT HAVING TWO OR MORE DEPENDENTS AND OWNING A HOME WERE FACTORS RELATED TO BECOMING REEMPLOYED. A HIGHER PROPORTION OF REEMPLOYED WORKERS HAD TAKEN TESTS AND RECEIVED TRAINING THROUGH THE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE. REFERRAL TO NEW JOBS WAS THE KEY SERVICE OFFERED BY THE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE, AND THOUGH ITS RECORDS SHOWED THAT 20 PERCENT OF THE MACK POPULATION WERE REFERRED TO NEW JOBS, QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE SAID ONLY 5 PERCENT OBTAINED THEIR NEW JOBS THIS WAY. THE REEMPLOYED WORKERS TENDED TO BE WORKING AT LOWER PAYING JOBS REQUIRING USE OF FEWER OF THEIR SKILLS AND THE SAME OR LONGER HOURS. IT WAS RECOMMENDED THAT SUPPORT BE GIVEN THROUGH NECESSARY FUNDING AND STAFFING FOR A COMPLETE FOLLOW-THROUGH AND TESTING OF FINDINGS. (MM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED015285

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Automation Manpower Services
PROGRAM REPORT

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
W. WILLARD WIRTZ, SECRETARY

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY
Washington, D. C. 20210

VT003802

December, 1965

THE "MACK" WORKER

The Impact of His Job Loss 2½ Years Later

DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY

STATE OF NEW JERSEY

NEW JERSEY STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE
affiliated with U. S. Employment Service

Richard J. Hughes
Governor

Raymond F. Male
Commissioner of
Labor and Industry

Edward J. Hall
Director, Div. of
Employment Security

By

DR. BERNARD P. INDIK

Associate Research Specialist

Rutgers — The State University

In Cooperation With

The Automation-Manpower Services Unit

Field Operations Service

New Jersey State Employment Service

Foreword

Twenty Automation Manpower Services demonstration projects were started in eleven states during 1961-63, to gain experience with labor market problems arising from changing technology and mass layoffs. The projects are financed and guided by the United States Employment Service and conducted by affiliated State Employment Services.

The fundamental aim is to combine action and research to demonstrate what the Employment Service can do in rapidly changing labor markets.

In this general context,. the projects are designed to:

1. Provide direct intensified personnel service to affected workers to promote occupational reorientation, minimize duration of unemployment, and to experiment with training and retraining techniques.

2. Analyze changing jobs and staffing patterns to gain information about evolving job content and training requirements in establishments affected by technological change.

3. Conduct labor market and related research in conjunction with these projects to develop procedures and methods that will assist the Employment Service in carrying out effective manpower actions in advance of the development of problems.

While the projects cover a broad range of remedial manpower actions—from the use of training funds to development of aptitude tests for new occupations—not every project includes the whole range of possible actions. Each project is tailored to the manpower problem presented by the particular case, whether it involves layoffs, in-plant workforce adjustments, reduced hiring, or the need for all-out community action.

As each of the present and future projects reaches a point at which summarization of experience and findings is possible, reports will be prepared for this series of Automation Program Reports, so that the project results may be disseminated throughout the public Employment Service system, and used to improve manpower planning and operations.

Louis Levine, *Director*

United States Employment Service

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY, Robert C. Goodwin, *Administrator*

Preface

This report describes a follow-up study of those individuals who were laid off from the Mack Truck Plant in Plainfield, New Jersey, after October 1961. This follow-up study on the former Mack employees was completed as of May 1964. It should be viewed jointly with the earlier report on the former Mack workers as of November 1962.

It is intended that this report clarify and amplify the findings of the prior report so that the more long term consequences of the Mack Plant shutdown will become clear.

For this follow-up study as with the prior study of the former Mack employees, the data were collected through the aegis of the Division of Employment Security of the Department of Labor and Industry of the State of New Jersey. The analysis of this data and the present report are the undertakings of the writer.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	i
Preface	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Tables	iv
Background	1
The Original Study	2
Chapter I —The Follow-up Study	4
Chapter II —Comparison of the Results of the Follow-up Study With Results of The Original Study	8
Chapter III—Comparison of the Characteristics of Those Former Mack Workers Who Were Not Working Two and One-half Years After the Layoff in October of 1961	13
Chapter IV—Summary of Findings and Actions Taken	22
Appendix #1—Survey Letter and Questionnaire	25
Appendix #2—Summary of Questionnaire Response as of May 31, 1964	27

LIST OF TABLES

Table		*Page*
1.	Responses of Former Mack Workers Who Were Presently Working	4
2.	Responses of Former Mack Workers Who Were Presently Not Working	5 & 6
3.	Comparison of Descriptive Characteristics of the 1117 Individuals of the Follow-up Study (1964) and the 2456 Individuals of the Original Study (1962)	9
4.	Comparison of Employment Experiences of the 1117 Individuals of the Follow-up Study (1964) and the 2456 Individuals of the Original Study (1962)	10
5.	Comparison of Employment Service Services Given of the 1117 Individuals of the Follow-up Study (1964) and the 2456 Individuals of the Original Study (1962)	11
6.	Comparison of "Willingness to Take Steps to Get New Jobs" of the 1117 Individuals of the Follow-up Study (1964) and the 2456 Individuals of the Original Study (1962)	12
7.	Age vs Work Status	13 & 14
8.	Work Status, by Education	15
9.	Work Status by Home Ownership	16
10.	Work Status, by Willingness to Take Specific Steps Toward Reemployment	16 & 17
11.	Work Status, by Use of Employment Service Services	18
12.	Work Status, by Number of Times Applicant was Referred to Employment	19
13.	Method of Obtaining Employment	20
14.	How New Job Compared With Job Held at Mack	20

Background

This study describes the more long term consequences of a large plant shutdown in terms of the individuals involved and their characteristics that were shown to be important indicators of their reemployability in the earlier study. It is, however, important to view this study in the context in which it occurred. This context was well described in our earlier report.

"The Mack Truck Corporation, one of the nation's largest heavy-duty truck manufacturers, on October 31, 1961 shut down its main assembly plant located in Plainfield, New Jersey, moved it to Hagerstown, Maryland, and laid off over 3,000 professional, clerical and production workers.

"This huge plant, equivalent in area to five square blocks, for some 40 forty years had been one of the employment mainstays of a mixed urban and suburban area of central New Jersey and was considered a fixture of the economic topography.

"The shock that the move created in what was considered a sound growing industrial area, was more than the loss of its employment payroll and its pay scales that were 25 percent above comparable jobs. In the Mack area, the unemployment rate was already moderately high (5.5 percent) with the recession of 1961 contributing to the jobless total. Concern centered on the losses and costs which the individuals and the communities affected would necessarily suffer during the period of transition and readjustment.

"To Plainfield and the other municipalities where the workers resided, the temporary loss of a weekly payroll of $800,000 and a tax bill of $240,000 per year was a serious matter. In addition, the Mack move might be considered a premonitory sign of what might happen to other area industries located in old outmoded plants which were heavily unionized and paying relatively high wages.

"In long-run perspective, however, reassuring factors were plentifully evident. Continuous growth in home owning and rental population, the recent entry of large retailing complexes and other new firms, the construction of a new limited access highway—all gave promise of vigorous economic growth. Moreover, large as the Mack work force was, the plant was only one element in a busy industrial, retail, and service area composed of a wide variety of raw material processors, finished products manufacturers, independent and national, retailers, wholesalers, and service agencies. With a total average employment of approximately 400,000 and an average quarterly payroll of $50,511,982 within a 20-mile radius of the Mack plant, the area faced no real economic disaster.

"In an economic area of such character, the situation of Mack's displaced personnel could not be considered desperate. Eventual reabsorption of a large proportion of the displaced workers, though probably not at their former pay rates, could almost be taken for granted. The public and the local authorities in Plainfield and vicinity worried mostly about the short-run costs of a temporary upsurge of unemployment."[1]

[1]Division of Employment Security, Department of Labor and Industry, State of New Jersey, *The "Mack" Project*, Automation Manpower Services Program, Demonstration Project No. 12, Automation Program Report No. 6, United States Employment Service, November, 1964.

THE ORIGINAL STUDY

This follow-up study of the former workers of the Mack Truck Plant in Plainfield, New Jersey, should be explored with an eye toward the earlier report and with a view toward the implications of the findings presented here for effective action by state and local authorities in the event of a major plant shutdown.

The major points of the initial study should be reviewed at this point so as to lend perspective to this follow-up study.

Starting October 31, 1961, the Mack Truck Corporation started a shutdown of its plant in Plainfield, New Jersey, and in the process eliminated the jobs of more than 3,000 well paid union organized and predominantly long service employees in New Jersey.

A few weeks prior to the shutdown, the New Jersey Employment Service attempted an all-out effort to facilitate the reemployment of the former Mack employees through a campaign among employers for job listings. The Employment Service also attempted to expose the former Mack workers to a full range of available services. Several weeks later the Employment Service added a research goal to try to ascertain the characteristics and attitudes which distinguished those former Mack employees *who found work as of one year after the shutdown* from those former employees *who did not find work one year after the layoff*.

The Results

"By the year's end, most of the Mack workers (about 60 percent) had found new jobs. The action program of the Employment Service, beset by a succession of problems from the start, was responsible for about 20 percent of these placements. However, the research program, added belatedly, proved more than a modest success. It pinpointed worker attitudes, and characteristics strongly associated with reemployment, identified weaknesses of Employment Service methods, and outlined promising remedies. Among specific findings were the following:

"A receptive attitude toward mobility—a willingness to change occupations, travel long distances, take training—appeared to mark the successful jobseekers.

"Two or more dependents, home ownership, availability of an automobile, and completion of at least a grammar school education also were more frequent among those who founds jobs.

"Affluence apparently did not make idleness attractive. Although Mack workers were entitled to separation benefits averaging $5,500 (including Supplemental Unemployment Benefits, State Unemployment Compensation as well as double pension benefits for those over 58), the majority had not exhausted their unemployment compensation rights a year after layoff, and many had taken jobs paying little more than the combined benefits they might have claimed.

"Age, contrary to findings of other studies, proved no insurmountable obstacle to reemployment. When comparing working with nonworking status within age brackets, increasing rates of reemployment were coupled with ascending age up to 58—the age at which double pension benefits available from the company became effective.

"Among Employment Office services, the number of referrals seemed particularly closely linked to reemployment, whether the direct result of the referrals or the workers' own job-seeking efforts.

"About one-third of the Mack work force received no services after registration; more than one-half received no referrals. Most services—training, testing, counseling and referral—were differentially given to the younger, better educated males . . . the most marketable of the displaced workers."[2]

[2]Division of Employment Security—The "Mack" Project, November 1964.

Chapter I: THE FOLLOW-UP STUDY

Now we may turn to the results of the follow-up study that was collected in March, April and was completed as of May 31, 1964. Questionnaires were sent to the over 3,000 former Mack employees. Responses were received from 1,663 persons. Over *seventy-six percent were presently working* while more *than twenty-three percent were not presently working.*

Clearly from Table 1, it can be seen that by far the largest category of the 1,275 persons that replied to the questionnaire who found work after that layoff did so by "applying directly" for employment rather than going through an intermediary. The second most frequent aid to job finding was through friends or relatives. Newspaper ads also provided a significant means of finding out about available jobs. The State Employment Service was seen as a means to getting a job by 5.25 percent, a somewhat higher percentage than the private employment agencies (3.92 percent).

TABLE 1

RESPONSES OF FORMER MACK WORKERS WHO WERE PRESENTLY WORKING

Question: How did you get the job?	Frequency	Percent
N. J. State Employment Service	67	5.25
Private Employment Agency	50	3.92
Union	33	2.59
Friends or Relatives	270	21.18
Applying Directly	482	37.80
Newspaper Ad	187	14.67
Other	140	10.98
No Data	46	3.61
Totals	1275	100.00
Question: Is this the only job you have had since the Mack layoff?		
Yes	629	49.33
No	575	45.10
No data	71	5.57
Totals	1275	100.00
Question: If you had more than one job since the Mack layoff, how many did you have?		
Two	355	27.84
Three or more	227	17.80
No data*	693	54.36
Totals	1275	100.00

*629 of this category answered to the prior question that their present job was their only job since the layoff.

About half (49.33 percent) of those replying to the questionnaire after they found work stayed on the same job while about 45 percent had two or more jobs.

With respect to those who were presently not working who replied in the follow-up study (23%) (see Table 2) we found that more than 45 percent had held jobs since the original Mack layoff while 42.5 percent had not been employed and somewhat more than 12 percent did not reply to this question. On the question of how long individuals who were presently not working and who had obtained work

during the time between the layoff and the present, we found that 66 had worked more than one year while 59 had worked between four months and one year. Thirty-one had worked between three and four months, while 21 had worked three months or less.

TABLE 2

RESPONSES OF FORMER MACK WORKERS WHO WERE PRESENTLY NOT WORKING

	Frequency	Percent
Question: Have you worked since the Mack layoff?		
Yes	175	45.10
No	165	42.53
No data	48	12.37
Totals	388	100.00
Question: How long did you work?		
1 month or less	9	2.32
More than 1 month and less than 2 months	6	1.55
More than 2 months and less than 3 months	6	1.55
More than 3 months and less than 4 months	31	7.98
More than 4 months and less than one year	59	15.21
More than one year	66	17.01
No data	211	54.38
Totals	388	100.00
Question: If you worked since the Mack layoff, how many jobs did you have?		
One	81	20.88
Two	44	11.34
Three or more	50	12.88
No data	213	54.90
Totals	388	100.00
Question: Are you looking for work now?		
Yes	207	53.35
No	159	40.98
No data	22	5.67
Totals	388	100.00
Question: What is the minimum acceptable weekly salary?		
Less than $71	14	3.61
71-80	46	11.86
81-90	20	5.15
91-100	49	12.63
100 or more	38	9.79
No data	221	56.96
Totals	388	100.00

TABLE 2 (con't.)

RESPONSES OF FORMER MACK WORKERS WHO WERE PRESENTLY NOT WORKING

		Frequency	Percent
Question:	**How far would you commute to work?**		
	20 miles or less	136	35.05
	20 to 30 miles	29	7.47
	30 miles or more	23	5.93
	No data	200	51.55
	Totals	388	100.00
Question:	**A. If you are looking for work, are you interested in training?**		
	Yes	161	41.49
	No	52	13.40
	No data	175	45.11
Totals		388	100.00
Question:	**B. If you are looking for work, are you interested in training?**		
	In new skills	60	15.46
	In improving present skills	58	14.95
	No data	270	69.59
Totals		388	100.00
Question:	**To help get your job or provide training opportunities, would you like the assistance of N. J. Employment Service?**		
	Yes*	189	48.71
	No	63	16.24
	No data	136	35.05
Totals		388	100.00

*Of the 189 who indicated a need for Employment Service assistance, only 49 reported to their local office within 30 days of notification.

Table 2 also shows that of those presently not working 81 had had only one job in the interim since the layoff, while 44 had had two jobs and 50 had had three or more jobs. We may also note that only about 53 percent of those who were presently not working were presently looking for work. Whether this was because the others were not interested in looking for work, had looked for work so long unsuccessfully that they had given up, or were satisfied with their pension income and so not interested in working is very hard to tell.

Of those who were presently not working 14 individuals indicated that they would take less than $71.00 as a minimum weekly salary. Forty-six felt that their minimum weekly salary should be between $71.00 and $80.00, while 20 felt that between $81.00 and $90.00 was their minimum weekly salary requirement. Forty-nine felt that their minimum should be between $91.00 and $100.00 weekly and 38 required a minimum over $100.00 per week.

Table 2 also indicates that most (136) of those in this general category of "*presently not working*" who answered the question "How far would you commute to work?" felt that 20 miles or less was an appropriate response. One hundred and sixty-one people responded favorably in terms of being inter-

ested in training. These were evenly split between those interested in training in new skills vs. training to improve present skills. The response to the questionnaire showed that 189 individuals who were presently not working wanted the help of the N. J. Employment Service, however, only 49 people of this group reported to their local office within 30 days after the entire 189 people were notified to come in for Employment Service assistance.

So much then for the overall findings of the total descriptive follow-up study. The next major question comes in two parts:

How do the results of the follow-up (March, April, May 1964) study population compare with the original one year after (October, November 1962) the Mack layoff study?

A) Which sample is the most appropriate sample to compare with the original one year after the layoff study that compares the characteristics of those working with those presently not working?

B) With reference to the characteristics of those presently *working* as compared to those presently *not working* as of the follow-up study, how do the data collected in October, November 1962, one year after the original layoff compare with the data collected in March, April and May 1964, two and one-half years after the original layoff?

Chapter II: COMPARISON OF THE RESULTS OF THE FOLLOW-UP STUDY WITH RESULTS OF THE ORIGINAL STUDY

In order to properly compare the results of the follow-up study with the results of the original study it is necessary to compare either the same people or a comparable set of individuals at the two points in time. One way of approximating this is to compare the overall characteristics of the original study sample with the overall characteristics of a comparable set of individuals taken from the follow-up study.

Remembering that the original layoff included about 3100 people and that the original study had a study sample of 2,456 individuals and that the follow-up study had responses from 1,663 people, what study sample of individuals of the follow-up study should give us a picture of what happened to these individuals so thoroughly studied in the one year after layoff study? That is, in order to answer the question *was there any change two and one-half years after the layoff with reference to the characteristics of those presently working as compared to those presently not working* as compared to one year after the layoff, we need comparable groups at these two points in time.

One way of approximating this requirement is to use for comparison purposes the original 2,456 study sample compared with a matched subset of individuals taken from the 1,663 individuals in the follow-up study. This matched sample of 1,117 persons contains all individuals in the follow-up sample who were also present in the 2,456 sample.

As a double check to assure comparability of the 1,117 sample from the two-and-one-half-year follow-up study with the 2,456 sample from the original one year post-layoff study, we compared the characteristics of the two samples. (See Tables 3, 4, 5, and 6).

It can be seen from Table 3 that the age distribution for the two and one-half-year follow-up study sample (N-1117) is not materially different from the original study sample (N-2456). The sex distribution for the two samples is nearly identical. In terms of number of dependents we find similar distributions, except that there is a slight tendency for the two and one-half-year follow-up study sample to have a slightly higher proportion in the one dependent category and a slightly lower proportion in the zero and two dependents categories. The more recent sample also has a slightly higher proportion of home owners and a slightly higher proportion of "married." However, there is no material difference in the proportion in the two samples who exhausted their unemployment insurance claims. Generally then, with reference to the variables shown in Table 3, there are no major differences in the distribution of any of these variables for these two study samples.

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF DESCRIPTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE 1117 INDIVIDUALS OF THE FOLLOW-UP STUDY (1964) AND THE 2456 INDIVIDUALS OF THE ORIGINAL STUDY (1962)

(Data Characteristics of 1962 Taken for Both Sets of Individuals)

CHARACTERISTICS	NOVEMBER 1962 INDIVIDUALS N=2456	MARCH-APRIL MAY 1964 INDIVIDUALS N=1117
Age (in years)	(in percent)	(in percent)
30 and under	12.54	11.73
31-44	35.99	36.35
45-57	33.39	33.30
58 and over	14.86	14.68
No answer	3.22	3.94
Total percent	100.00	100.00
Sex		
Male	91.37	92.12
Number of Dependents		
Zero	20.93	19.34
One	21.66	25.07
Two	21.34	19.52
Three	16.49	17.01
Four or more	14.98	15.13
No answer	4.60	3.93
Total percent	100.00	100.00
Home Ownership		
Yes	59.41	62.94
Marital Status		
Single	10.30	9.31
Married	79.07	82.72
Other	6.76	4.12
No answer	3.87	3.85
Total percent	100.00	100.00
Claims Exhausted		
Yes	26.22	25.07

Let us now look at how these two samples compared with reference to employment experiences between the layoff and Novmber of 1962. From Table 4 we can see that there is a somewhat higher proportion of persons (72%) who were presently working November 1962 in the 1964 sample than in the original one year follow-up sample (66%). There also was a slightly higher proportion of persons (77%) who were employed at some time during the first year after the layoff in the 1964 sample than in the original one year follow-up sample (72%). However, the 1964 sample was similar in proportion to the sample of November 1962 "not working and not looking for work." There were also similar proportions in the two samples in terms of the number of jobs held between the layoff and November 1962. Finally, there were also similar proportions in the two samples for the various amounts of time that the "longest job lasted" during the October 1961 to November 1962 period.

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCES OF THE 1117 INDIVIDUALS OF THE FOLLOW-UP STUDY (1964) AND THE 256 INDIVIDUALS OF THE ORIGINAL STUDY (1962)

(Data is Taken From the 1962 Study for Both Sets of Individuals)

EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCES	NOVEMBER 1962 STUDY INDIVIDUALS N=2456 (in percent)	MARCH-APRIL MAY 1964 STUDY INDIVIDUALS N=1117 (in percent)
Presently Working as of November 1962		
Yes	65.73	72.25
No	28.53	26.77
No data	5.74	.98
Total percent	100.00	100.00
Worked in Period Between Layoff and November 1962		
Yes	71.78	77.35
No	19.02	18.26
No data	9.20	4.39
Total percent	100.00	100.00
Not Working and Not Looking for Work—November 1962		
Yes	18.53	17.99
No	9.93	8.95
No data	71.54	73.06
Total percent	100.00	100.00
How Many Jobs Did You Have Between Layoff and November 1962?		
One	44.62	48.70
Two	17.59	19.07
Three or more	8.59	8.15
No answer	29.20	24.08
Total percent	100.00	100.00
How Long Did the Longest Job Last During Post-Layoff to November 1962 Period		
Less than one month	3.83	3.94
1-2 months	5.21	6.18
2-4 months	9.53	9.94
4-6 months	10.06	10.83
6-9 months	11.95	9.58
Over 9 months	21.42	23.99
No answer	38.00	35.54
Total percent	100.00	100.00

Comparing the two samples with reference to the use of Employment Service services up to November of 1962, we can see in Table 5 that the two samples showed very similar proportions. Specifically, the two sets of proportions are very similar for "times referred", "counseling offered", "counseling given", "specific tests given" and "training accepted." We would then conclude that with reference to the relative use of Employment Service services these two samples are quite comparable.

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICE SERVICES GIVEN OF THE 1117 INDIVIDUALS OF THE FOLLOW-UP STUDY (1964) AND THE 2456 INDIVIDUALS OF THE ORIGINAL STUDY (1962)

(Data is Taken From the 1962 Study for Both Sets of Individuals)

USE OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICE SERVICES	NOVEMBER 1962 STUDY INDIVIDUALS N=2456	MARCH-APRIL MAY 1964 STUDY INDIVIDUALS N=1117
Times Referred	(in percent)	(in percent)
None	58.63	55.95
Once	19.06	19.52
Two to four	16.41	17.64
Five and over	1.87	2.68
No answer	4.03	4.21
Total percent	100.00	100.00
Counseling Offered		
Yes	16.37	15.40
No	80.05	80.66
No answer	3.58	3.94
Total percent	100.00	100.00
Counseling Given		
Given	15.35	14.06
Not given	1.18	1.52
No answer	83.47	84.42
Total percent	100.00	100.00
Specific Test Given		
S.A.T.B.	1.55	1.79
G.A.T.B.	25.24	27.75
Proficiency	.61	.63
None or no answer	72.60	69.83
Total percent	100.00	100.00
Training Accepted		
Yes	13.72	12.89
No	8.75	7.16
No data	77.53	79.95
Total percent	100.00	100.00

Table 6 compares the two samples with reference to "willingness to take steps to get new jobs" at the time of the initial layoff. Specifically, we find about the same proportion in the two samples not willing to transfer with the Mack Company to Hagerstown, Maryland—88.3 percent of the November 1962 sample and 90 percent of the 1964 sample. Approximately similar proportions of the two samples said that they would consider a new line of work—67.2 percent for the 1962 study sample and 69.4 percent for the 1964 study sample. Interest in training was also similar for the two samples —58.1 percent for the 1962 sample and 61.3 percent of the 1964 sample manifested an interest in training in new skills in new occupations.

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF "WILLINGNESS TO TAKE STEPS TO GET "NEW JOBS" OF THE 1117 INDIVIDUALS OF THE FOLLOW-UP STUDY (1964) AND THE 2456 INDIVIDUALS OF THE ORIGINAL STUDY (1962)

(Data is Taken From the 1961 Immediate Post Layoff Study for Both Sets of Individuals)

WILLINGNESS TO TAKE STEPS TO GET NEW JOBS	NOVEMBER 1962 STUDY INDIVIDUALS N=2456 (in percent)	MARCH-APRIL MAY 1964 STUDY INDIVIDUALS N=1117 (in percent)
Would consider a new line of work		
Yes	67.18	69.38
Interest in training		
For new skills in new occupation	58.10	61.33
Transfer with the Mack Company		
No	88.31	90.78
Plan to seek other work		
Yes	91.16	91.41
Want help in seeking employment		
Yes	90.72	91.77
Willing to take counseling and testing		
Yes	60.50	63.12

We also find that the two samples show at the time of the original layoff in November 1961 about an equal proportion who plan to seek other work after the layoff—91.2 percent in the 1962 sample and 91.4 percent in the 1964 sample. Similarly, about the same proportions wanted help in seeking employment in November of 1961—90.7 percent in the 1962 study sample and 91.8 percent in the 1964 sample. It is also true that the two samples are comparable on the proportions in the two samples who are willing to take counseling and testing—60.5 percent in the 1962 sample and 63.1 percent in the 1964 sample.

It is again clear that these two samples are quite comparable not only on characteristics reflecting "willingness to take steps to get new jobs" but also on a very large proportion of the variable considered in the tables just presented. (See Tables, 3, 4, 5 and 6). With this in mind we can accept the idea of comparability in these two study samples with reference to the distributions of the overall characteristics so far studied. We can now ask the major question of this follow-up study "Do the same characteristics that differentiated those who were *working* from those who were *not working* in the one year after the layoff study still hold when the former Mack workers are again studied two and one-half years after the original layoff?" This is the question that is to be answered in the next chapter.

Chapter III: COMPARISON OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THOSE FORMER MACK WORKERS WHO WERE NOT WORKING TWO AND ONE-HALF YEARS AFTER THE LAYOFF IN OCTOBER OF 1961

In this chapter we are interested in two major questions:

1) What were the characteristics that differentiated those presently working (two years after the layoff) from those who were presently not working?

2) How did the characteristics that differentiated *these* two groups (March-April-May, 1964) compare with the characteristics that differentiated those who were working from those who were not working one year after (November 1962) the layoff in Ocotber of 1961?

In order to present the factual data with reference to each characteristic for each of the two groups at each of the two points in time each table will contain the data appropriately classified. Let us now turn to the demographic characteristics.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Age

The data in the two studies that deals with the relationship of work status and age is very interesting. The original study and the follow-up study show very similar results when work status is analyzed by age. In Table 7(a) we can see that these two distributions are very similar in that in terms of those "working" over 90 percent are below age 58 for the original sample and about 88 percent are below age 58 for the follow-up sample. The highest percentages of "not working" fall in the 58 and over age in both studies.

TABLE 7

AGE VS. WORK STATUS

(a) WORK STATUS, BY AGE

(in percent)

	Original Study Nov. 1962		Follow-Up Study	
Age-Years	Working N=1614	Not Working N=708	Working N=863	Not Working N=254
30 and under	13.7	10.7	12.7	8.3
31-44	41.4	22.4	40.8	21.3
45-57	36.0	27.1	34.7	28.3
58 and over	5.8	35.8	7.7	38.6
No age data	3.1	4.0	4.1	3.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 7

(b) WORK STATUS, WITHIN AGE CATEGORIES

Original Study Nov. 1962
(in percent)

	30 or younger	31-44	45-57	58 or older	No Data on Age
Working Nov. 1962	74.4	80.8	86.3	27.1	64.1
Not Working Nov. 1962	25.6	19.2	13.7	72.9	35.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number of workers	297	828	672	347	78

Grand Total N-2222

(c) FOLLOW-UP STUDY (APRIL, MAY, 1964)

(in percent)

	30 or younger	31-44	45-57	58 or older	No Data on Age
Working May, 1964	86.6	86.7	81.5	41.0	79.5
Not working May, 1964	13.4	13.3	18.5	59.0	20.5
Number of workers	131	406	372	164	44
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Grand Total = 1117

Further, if we look at work status within age categories we find that the increase in percent reemployed associated with age up to age 58 (Table 7[b]) that was found in the original study does not reappear in the follow-up study (Table 7[c]). However, the same reversal in percentages that appeared at age 58 in the original study does appear to a lesser degree in the follow-up study. In the follow-up study over 80 percent of those former Mack workers studied in each age category under age 58 are in the working population as of April or May of 1964 (Table 7[c]). In the 58 and older category the original study showed only 27.1 percent in the presently working category whereas the follow-up study shows 41.0 percent in this category. It seems then that from Tables 7(b) and 7(c) we can note that there are increases in the proportions "working" when the two study populations are compared—for those under 30, those from 31-44, and those 58 and older when the two samples are compared. A minor decline in the percentage presently working occurred in 45-57 age category, but even in this category over 80% were presently working as of May 1964 in this follow-up sample.

It is therefore clear that in the age categories under age 58, the older age is not in itself a necessary barrier to reemployment. The figures in the original study and also in our follow-up study show no severe age barrier to reemployment in the up to age 57 categories for this sample.

Education

When work status was analyzed by level of education it was clear in the original study that the level of education was a factor of importance in this study. Similar findings are present in the follow-up sample as can be seen in Table 8. A higher proportion of those that are in the presently not work-

ing as compared to those in the presently working category show only between 0 and 7 years of school completed while a larger proportion of those presently working show 12 years of school or more. These facts are true for both the original and the follow-up samples.

TABLE 8

WORK STATUS, BY EDUCATION

(in percent)

Years of School Completed	Original Study Nov. 1962		Follow-Up Study	
	Working N=1614	Not Working N=708	Working N=863	Not Working N=254
0-7	9.8	26.7	9.9	26.4
8-11	44.7	42.3	44.7	41.3
12 and over	44.6	27.8	44.0	31.1
No data	0.9	3.2	1.4	1.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

WORK STATUS, BY NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS

(in percent)

Number of Dependents	Original Study Nov. 1962		Follow-Up Study	
	Working N=1614	Not Working N=708	Working N=863	Not Working N=254
Not Self[1]	1.9	4.7	0.1	0.0
Self Only[2]	16.7	29.6	16.0	30.7
One	18.4	30.8	21.7	36.6
Two	26.1	13.5	22.6	9.1
Three	17.9	10.7	18.6	11.8
Four or More	17.9	7.4	17.0	8.7
No Data	1.1	3.3	4.0	3.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

[1]Respondents who described themselves as dependents of others.
[2]Respondents who supported themselves, but claimed no dependents.

Number of Dependents

In the original study we found that more than 61% of those presently working one year after the layoff had two or more dependents as compared to 31.6% of those not working at that time. This seemed like an indication of a "push" factor operating on those with more dependents putting more pressure on them to work to provide an income. This same finding is also present in the follow-up study sample since 58.2% of those presently working as of April-May of 1964 had more than two dependents and only 29.6% of those not working at that time had more than two dependents.

Home Ownership

Another "push" factor that seemed indicated in the original study was that among those in the working category a higher proportion were home owners. Over 63% of those *working* at that time were home owners as compared to 55.8% of those *not working* who owned their own homes. In the follow-up sample nearly the exact same proportion of homeowners were found among those working in April and May of 1964. However, the proportion of homeowners among those not working increased to 60.3%. It seems then that home ownership is less of a push into the job market over the long run than over the short run period.

TABLE 9

WORK STATUS BY HOME OWNERSHIP

(in percent)

	Original Study Nov. 1962		Follow-Up Study	
Home Ownership	Working N=1614	Not Working N=708	Working N=863	Not Working N=254
Yes	63.5	55.8	63.7	60.3
No	32.1	37.1	30.8	35.4
No Data	4.4	7.1	5.5	4.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

WILLINGNESS TO TAKE INSTRUMENTAL STEPS TOWARD A NEW JOB

One of the most interesting findings in the original study was that those former Mack workers who indicated a willingness to take specific steps toward obtaining a new job were much more likely to be in the working population one year after the initial layoff than those who were less willing to take these specific steps.

It can be seen from Table 10 that in the original sample 73.8% of those working one year after the layoff were willing to consider a new line of work whereas only 53.9% of those not working at that time were willing to consider a new line of work. In the follow-up study nearly the same proportions were also found. The follow-up study showed these proportions to be 73.7% and 54.7% respectively.

TABLE 10

WORK STATUS, BY WILLINGNESS TO TAKE SPECIFIC STEPS TOWARD REEMPLOYMENT

	Original Study Nov. 1962		Follow-Up Study	
Wanted to Consider a New Line of Work	Working N=1614	Not Working N=708	Working N=863	Not Working N=254
Yes	73.8	53.9	73.7	54.7
No	23.4	39.6	23.1	40.6
No Data	2.8	6.5	3.2	4.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	Original Study Nov. 1962		Follow-Up Study	
Willing to Take Counseling and Testing	Working N=1614	Not Working N=708	Working N=863	Not Working N=254
Yes	66.9	49.0	66.9	50.4
No	29.9	44.4	29.5	44.9
No Data	3.2	6.6	3.6	4.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 10 (Cont.)

Willing to Take Training	Original Study Nov. 1962 Working N=1614	Original Study Nov. 1962 Not Working N=708	Follow-Up Study Working N=863	Follow-Up Study Not Working N=254
Present Occupation to Improve Skills	8.2	7.2	6.7	5.9
New Skills and New Occupations	64.8	46.2	65.7	46.5
Not Interested	23.7	40.0	24.1	42.9
No Data	3.3	6.6	3.5	4.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Similarly, in the original sample taken one year after the layoff, 66.9% were willing to take counseling and testing in the reemployed category whereas, only 49.0% of those not working were willing to take counseling and testing. In the follow-up study simiiar proportions were found—66.9% of those working in April-May of 1964 were willing to take counseling and testing whereas, only 50.4% of those not working were willing to take counseling and testing.

Finally, Table 10 shows that in the original sample 64.8% of those working one year after the layoff were willing to take training in occupations that were new to them while only 46.2% of those not working were willing to take training in new skills for new occupations. Similar proportions were found in the follow-up sample—65.7% of those working in 1964 were willing to take training in new skills for new occupations whereas only 46.5% of those not working in April and May of 1964 were willing to take training in new skills for new occupations.

In summary then, it is clear that the findings in the original study that supported the idea that "willingness to take specific steps toward reemployment" was related to whether or not a former Mack worker was reemployed one year after the layoff was also supported by the data obtained two and one half years after the initial layoff.

USE OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICE SERVICES

The principal services that were made available by the Employment Service to the former Mack workers included counseling, testing, training and job referral. Records were kept in the local offices as to how many former Mack workers were offered and/or were given these services during the year after the layoff. The work or non-work status of each of the former Mack workers was obtained from questionnaires obtained in November of 1962 and again in April-May of 1964. The question was whether there was any positive relationship between use of Employment Services services and success in finding work. The relevant data are presented in Tables 11 and 12.

In Table 11, at first glance, it seems that counseling made no difference. Those in the "working" and the "not working" categories a year after the layoff and two and one-half years after the layoff showed similar percentages who were offered and given counseling. If anything, in the follow-up sample, a higher proportion of those "not working" seemed to have had contact with counseling. For several reasons, however, this sheds little light on the general usefulness of counseling. Although it was announced before the layoff that counseling would be made available to all former Mack workers, actually less than one-fifth of the former Mack workers were offered and given this service. Further,

results may be influenced by the kind of counseling given, by who was selected for counseling and by the conditions under which it was given. Counseling, generally, is given to the most difficult cases and it should not be surprising that a higher proportion of those counseled did not get reemployed. Further, the counseling that was available to be given was of a very limited nature due to understaffing and time pressures and was therefore only of a surface nature at best.

TABLE 11

WORK STATUS, BY USE OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICE SERVICES

(in percent)

Service	Original Study		Follow-Up Study	
	Working	Not Working	Working	Not Working
Counseling Offered				
Yes	16.4	17.5	14.4	18.9
No	80.9	76.4	82.3	75.2
No Data	2.7	6.1	3.3	5.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Counseling Given				
Yes	15.4	16.2	13.2	17.0
No	1.1	1.6	1.4	1.9
Not Offered or No Data	83.5	82.2	85.4	81.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Testing				
Offered and Accepted	32.9	17.4	33.8	16.1
Offered and Refused	1.3	6.0	1.3	.4
Not Offered or No Data	65.8	76.6	64.9	83.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Training (as of June 1, 1962)				
Offered	21.3	24.4	19.9	20.1
Not Offered	75.7	69.3	76.5	73.6
No Data	3.0	6.3	3.6	6.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Training—Since Layoff and Before Nov. 1962				
Yes	13.3	4.6	13.2	5.1
No	76.2	82.3	77.3	78.8
No Data	10.5	13.1	9.5	16.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Testing does show a positive relationship with eventually getting reemployed. About one-third of those "working" as compared to about one-sixth of those "not working" had been tested. This surely does not reflect a direct "causal" relationship. However, two possibilities do exist. First, the willingness to take tests may have been a step toward more effective job finding or second, those selected for testing may have been differentially better risks in terms of being more likely to be placed.

With reference to training, only a small proportion were offered training and an even smaller proportion actually received training. A questionnaire administered in November of 1962 asked whether they had had training since the layoff. The majority of both those "working' and those "not working" had not received training. A very small proportion of these "not working" reported any training, but a somewhat larger proportion of those "working" had received training. This finding held up for the follow-up sample of April-May of 1964. The relationship is not a strong one probably because relatively little training was given.

The service that clearly had some relevance to subsequent job-finding was referral, though even here almost 60 percent did not receive this service. (See Table 12). Referral experience was clearly much more frequent in both the original sample and the follow-up sample among those "working" than among those "not working." The number of referrals per individual seems also to have made a difference.

TABLE 12

WORK STATUS, BY NUMBER OF TIMES APPLICANT WAS REFERRED TO EMPLOYMENT

Number of Times Applicant Referred to Employment	Original Study		Follow-Up Study	
	Working N=1614	Not Working N=708	Working N=863	Not Working N=254
Never Referred	55.1	68.5	52.7	66.9
Once	20.8	15.4	20.9	15.0
Two to Four	18.7	9.0	19.9	9.8
Five and Over	2.5	0.7	2.8	2.4
No Record	2.9	6.4	3.7	5.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

It was also pointed out in the original study that these services were given most frequently to only a minority and these tended to be the younger, better educated males. The most apparent reason for this fact is that probably the Employment Service in its desire to make placements centered its attentions on those applicant categories that offered the best chance of being placed within Employment Service's limitations of personnel and resources. This situation is more important for that other segment of the population of former Mack workers who did not receive Employment Service services. There are two questions that remain partially unanswered, "Why did some former Mack workers not come to the Employment Service for help?" and second "Why was the Employment Service not able to help some who came for help in getting a job?" Most assuredly the former population was larger than the latter but both are important questions to consider. We are here able to only partially suggest some answers.

The original study suggests one possible answer to the former question. Of those who obtained employment the Employment Service records indicate that they helped about 20 percent through referrals but from questionnaire data only a little more than five percent indicate that they obtained employment through the Employment Service. A much larger proportion felt that the help of friends, relatives, newspaper ads and filing applications was the method they used in getting a job. These feelings were characteristic of the follow-up sample workers as well as those in the original sample who were working. This evidence would seem to indicate that the former Mack workers under-estimated the effectiveness of the Employment Service and, therefore, used it less than they could or should have for help in getting a job.

TABLE 13

METHOD OF OBTAINING EMPLOYMENT

(As Noted in Questionnaire Data)
(in percent)

Obtained Through	Original Study Working (N=1614)	Follow-Up Study Working (N=863)
N.J.S.E.S.	5.5	5.2
Private Employment Agency	3.1	2.5
Union	2.1	2.1
Friends or Relatives	25.7	19.6
Newspaper Ads	14.8	13.7
Filing Applications	27.9	24.8
Other	16.8	13.9
No Data	4.1	18.2
Total	100.0	100.0

With reference to the second question it seems clear that only a portion (the most likely to be reemployed) received the full set of services available from the Employment Service. This may well reflect the "placement" orientation of the Employment Service.

Let us now turn to another question, what were the characteristics of the jobs the Mack workers took?

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NEW JOBS (NOV. 1962)

It should be remembered from the original study that the Mack workers were generally working in long term jobs that were paying relatively high wages with good hours and the jobs needed specialized skills. It is not surprising to find that both the original one year after layoff sample and the follow-up sample working category individuals found these jobs generally paying lower wages, tending to use less of their skills and requiring the same or longer hours. It is interesting to note though that many found jobs closer to home than the Mack Plant. It seems then that the follow-up study findings in this general area generally agrees with the original post layoff study findings.

TABLE 14

HOW NEW JOB COMPARED WITH JOB HELD AT MACK

(in percent)

	Original Study N=1614 Working	Follow-Up Study Working	
A. Wages are:			
Better	8.3	8.4	
Same	17.2	16.7	
Worse	74.5	74.9	
Total	100.0	100.0	N=669
B. Use of Work Skills are:			
Better	26.4	27.1	
Same	35.9	36.8	
Worse	37.7	36.1	
Total	100.0	100.0	N=649

TABLE 14 (con't.)

HOW NEW JOB COMPARED WITH JOB HELD AT MACK

(in percent)

	Original Study Nov. 1962 Working N=1614	Follow-Up Study Working	
C. Hours of Work are:			
Better	12.4	11.2	
Same	59.5	61.4	
Worse	28.1	27.4	
Total	100.0	100.0	N=672
D. Travel Distance is:			
Less	44.3	45.5	
Same	21.2	19.6	
More	34.5	34.9	
Total	100.0	100.0	N=674

Chapter IV: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND ACTIONS TAKEN

By and large the follow-up study sample findings reinforced the findings of the original study and made the conclusions and recommendations of that report more firm.

Of the over 3,000 employees of the Mack Truck Corporation in Plainfield, New Jersey, who were employed in October of 1961, our data indicate that 60.7 percent had been reemployed at new jobs as of November of 1962. At that time 20.4 percent were presently unemployed; 10.6 percent were out of the labor force; 4.2 percent had transferred to the new plant in Hagerstown, Maryland; 3.2 percent were still employed in the Plainfield plant and 0.9 percent were in an undetermined status. By April-May of 1964 about 76 percent were presently working and about 23 percent were presently *not* working. Of those who were presently working two and one-half years after the layoff over 59 percent had had this one job subsequent to the layoff, while over 27 percent had had two jobs and over 17 percent had had three or more jobs. There was no specific data from over 5 percent of those presently working. Of those who were presently not working over 45 percent had worked since the layoff, 42.5 percent had not worked and we had no specific data from over 12 percent of this sample. Of the sub-category of those who were presently *not* working but who had worked some time during the two-and one-half-year period over 46 percent had held only one job, while over 25 percent had held two jobs and over 28 percent had held three or more jobs. It is also true that many had a long period of unemployment and even more took jobs with lower pay and requiring lesser skills.

It is also true that on many points analyzed in the original study we find corroboration in the follow-up study:

1) Over 90 percent of the presently working population were under age 58 in the original study and 88 percent are under age 58 in the follow-up study.

2) In the original study we found that as age increased up to age 58 there was an increasing rate of reemployment but after age 58 (the double pension rights age) the trend was markedly reversed. In the follow-up study over 80 percent of those former Mack workers in each age category under age 58 were in the working population as of April of 1964. But the reversal in the post 58 category is not as severe in the 1964 data.

3) Both samples show higher proportions of those who have had only a grammar school education in the presently not working population.

4) Both samples also indicated that having two or more dependents and owning a home were factors related to becoming reemployed.

5) The follow-up study confirmed the finding that willingness to take steps toward reemployment on the part of the laid-off worker was related to whether or not a former Mack worker was reemployed.

6) With reference to Employment Service services and reemployment, *it is clear in both studies that referral to new jobs is the key service to those who were found in the reemployed category.* Whether this was because of referral *per se* or that the better prospects received more frequent referral is an interesting point. There is some evidence for both points of view. This

is pointed up by the fact that 43.6 percent of those presently working had been referred whereas 27.2 percent of those presently not working had been referred.

7) Testing though given to only about 25 percent of the population was more likely to have been given to a reemployed worker. Whether this was due to the better prospects being selected for testing or those more willing to take tests were more willing to take steps to be reemployed is unclear.

8) Only a small proportion received training, but a higher proportion of those who were working in the two samples as compared to those not working had received training.

9) Employment Service records showed that about 20 percent of the Mack population were referred to new jobs, while the questionnaire samples both showed somewhat more than 5 percent that said that they had obtained their new jobs through the New Jersey State Employment Service.

10) The reemployed Mack workers tended to be working at a lower skill and lower paying jobs that required the same or worse hours of work.

ACTIONS TAKEN

Since the findings of this follow-up report basically support the earlier study titled *The "Mack" Project* of November 1964 and since the recommendations made on pages 55 through 57 of that report would still hold true, it would be well to point out the actions taken by the New Jersey State Employment Service following its publication:

1. The creation of a Manpower Services Unit, specially funded through the cooperation of the Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor. Its primary function is to provide "action-research" relating to mass unemployment caused by automation, plant removal, obsolescence, technological change, or defense contract cutbacks.

2. An "Advance Notice Program" designed to provide notice of impending employment change affecting 100 or more workers has been developed. This system alerts policy making officials of the N. J. State Department of Labor and Industry, other appropriate state officials, and field personnel manning district and local Employment Service Offices in order that requisite action be taken. This action attempts to include the cooperation of the involved local comunities. From October 1964 through October 1965 advance notice of 56 mass layoffs and 607 newly locating employing establishments was relayed.

3. The Unit has supplied supplemental assistance to local offices to provide pre-layoff through post-layoff plans of service for workers affected by such separations.

4. The Unit has engaged in a study of mass layoffs to explore the most effective method or methods to minimize the spell of unemployment created by large scale worker displacement, the characteristics and attitudes of the workers in relation to reemployment adjustment. Significant findings relating to the influence of such characteristics and attitudes as "mobility attitudes", age, education, home ownership, seniority with previous employers, car ownership, etc. are in the process of publication in order to provide guideposts for Employment Service action.

5. To strengthen the Advance Notice Program the Unit has engaged in many supplementary activities. Relationships have been established with the community through governmental planning and industrial promotional bodies, school superintendents, industrial real-estate brokers, industrial development staff of public utilities, employer associations, labor unions in order to foster "Advance Notice" and enlist community cooperation. A concentrated effort has been made to reconstruct Community Manpower Advisory Committees as an effective instrument in enlisting community support. The "Dodge Reports," newspapers and periodicals are used as a source of information. Rutgers University, Bureau of Economic Research, is engaged in a pilot study with the ultimate goal—the design of a "Vulnerability Index" to provide indicators for anticipating changes in job demand.

6. Efforts are directed to maximize all possible avenues of employment. The Unit is working with the Small Business Administration, the N. J. State Department of Education in providing through the Employment Service avenues for self-employment. The plan calls for the selection and orientation of potential prospects for self-employment, enterpreneurial training, and technical and financial assistance in getting established. A pilot part-time office has shown the feasibility of developing specialized assistance to retirees and supplemental wage-earners and as a result part-time employment units are being installed in other Employment Service local offices. Extensive job-development programs including cooperation of community groups, direct mail, have been tailored specifically to meet the job needs of separatees.

7. Recommendations have been made for the establishment of pilot local offices to explore and devise more effective techniques to mitigate manpower problems.

A review of the above activities obviously points up that not all of the procedural and research suggestions have been followed as yet. It is recommended that support be given through necessary funding and staffing for a complete follow-through and testing of the findings.

References

Division of Employment Security, Department of Labor and Industry, State of New Jersey, *The "Mack" Project*, Automation Manpower Services Program, Demonstration Project No. 12, Automation Program. Report No. 6, United States Employment Service, November, 1964.

Haber, William, Ferman, Louis A., and Hudson, James R., *The Impact of Technological Change*, The W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research. Kalamazoo, Michigan, September, 1963.

APPENDIX #1

RAYMOND F. MALE
COMMISSIONER

EDWARD J. HALL
DIRECTOR

State of New Jersey
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY
DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

JOHN FITCH PLAZA
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625
Telephone: 292-2121

ADDRESS REPLY TO WRITER.
For Telephone Contact, Call:
294-3175

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

Dear Former Mack Worker:

Although it is more than two years since the closing of the Plainfield plant of Mack Trucks, Inc., the effects it had on the workers involved are still a matter of concern to us.

We are trying to reach those former Mack employees still unemployed, looking for work or seeking training, and to provide them with assistance in their job problems. It is for this reason that we again ask you to cooperate with us by supplying further information about your job situation.

Will you please complete the questionnaire on the back of this page and return it in the enclosed postage-free envelope by return mail? Thank you

Very truly yours,

Edward J. Hall

Edward J. Hall
Director

EJH:SBR

1664 · 1964
NEW JERSEY
TERCENTENARY
People • Purpose • Progress

Name _____ Social Security No. _____ Date _____

Street _____ City _____ State _____

	DO NOT MARK THIS COLUMN
ARE YOU WORKING NOW? Yes ☐ No ☐	
If you **ARE WORKING** now please answer Questions 1 through 3 only. If you are **NOT WORKING** now skip Questions 1 through 3, and please answer Questions 4 through 11.	
WORKING NOW 1. How Did You Get the Job? N. J. State Employment Service ☐ Private Employment Agency ☐ Union ☐ Friend or Relative ☐ Newspaper Ad ☐ Applying Directly ☐ Other ☐	
2. Is This the Only Job You've Had Since the Mack Layoff? Yes ☐ No ☐	
3. If You Had More Than One Job Since the Mack Layoff, How Many Did You Have? Two ☐ Three or More ☐	
NOT WORKING (If you are not working - please answer Questions 4 through 11) 4. Have You Worked Since the Mack Layoff? Yes ☐ No ☐	

	DO NOT MARK THIS COLUMN
5. How Long Did You Work? 1 Month or Less ☐ 2 Months or Less ☐ 3 Months or Less ☐ 6 Months or Less ☐ 1 Year or Less ☐ 2 Years or Less ☐	
6. If You Worked Since the Mack Layoff, How Many Jobs Did You Have? One ☐ Two ☐ Three or More ☐	
7. A. Are You Looking for Work Now? Yes ☐ No ☐	
B. What Kind of a Job Do You Want? First Choice Second Choice Third Choice Fourth Choice	
8. What Minimum Salary Will You Accept? Hourly Daily or Weekly	
9. How Far Would You Commute to Work? 20 Miles or Less ☐ 20 to 30 Miles ☐ 30 Miles or More ☐	
10. A. If You Are Looking For Work, Are You Interested in Training? Yes ☐ No ☐	
B. In New Skills ☐ In improving Present Skills ☐	
11. To Help Get You A Job or Provide Training Opportunities, Would You Like the Assistance of N. J. State Employment Service? Yes ☐ No ☐	

RESPONSE AS OF MAY 31, 1964

ARE YOU WORKING NOW?	Yes	1275
	No	388

WORKING NOW

1. How Did You Get the Job	Zero or Blank	46
N. J. State Employment Service		67
Private Employment Agency		50
Union		33
Friend or Relative		270
Applying Directly		482
Other		140
Newspaper Ad		187
		1275
2. Is This the Only Job You've Had Since The Mack Layoff?	Zero or Blank	71
	Yes	629
	No	575
		1275
3. If You Had More Than One Job Since the Mack Layoff, How Many Did You Have?	Zero or Blank	693
	Two	355
	Three or More	227
		1275

NOT WORKING (If you are not working - please answer Questions 4 through 11)

4. Have You Worked Since the Mack Layoff	Zero or Blank	48
	Yes	175
	No	165
		388
5. How Long Did You Work	Zero or Blank	211
1 Month or Less		9
2 Months or Less		6
3 Months or Less		6
6 Months or Less		31
1 Year or Less		59
2 Years or Less		66
		388
6. If You Worked Since the Mack Layoff, How Many Jobs Did You Have?	Zero or Blank	213
	One	81
	Two	44
	Three or More	50
		388
7. Are You Looking for Work Now?	Zero or Blank	22
	Yes	207
	No	159
		388
8. Minimum Acceptable Weekly Salary:	Zero or Blank	221
Less Than $71		14
71-80		46
81-90		20
91-100		49
Over $100		38
		388
9. How Far Would You Commute to Work?	Zero or Blank	200
20 Miles or Less		136
20 to 30 Miles		29
30 Miles or More		23
		388
10. A. If You Are Looking For Work, Are You Interested in Training?	Zero or Blank	175
	Yes	161
	No	52
		388
B. In New Skills		60
In Improving Present Skills		58
	Zero or Blank	270
		388
11. To Help Get Your Job or Provide Training Opportunities, Would You Like the Assistance of N. J. State Employment Service?	Zero or Blank	136
	*Yes	189
	No	63

*Of the 189 who indicated a need for E.S. assistance, only 49 reported to their local office within 30 days of notification.